



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/552,861	04/20/2000	Paul Alan Snow	AUS000181US1	4251

7590 09/17/2003

Duke W Yee  
Carstens Yee & Cahoon LLP  
P O Box 802334  
Dallas, TX 75380

EXAMINER

RUTTEN, JAMES D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2122	5

DATE MAILED: 09/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Applicant No.	Applicant(s)
	09/552,861	SNOW, PAUL ALAN
	Examiner	Art Unit
	J. Derek Ruttan	2122

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

**A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 April 2000.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 05 June 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____. 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.
---	---

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-24 have been examined.

### ***Drawings***

2. Figures 1, 2, and 3 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.
3. The drawings are objected to because Figure 9, step 908 has a typo: "effect" should be --affect--. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Specification***

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: A typo on page 33 line 5, where "scrips" should be --scripts--.

Appropriate correction is required.

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: A typo on page 35 line 6, where "an Change" should be --a change--.

Appropriate correction is required.

6. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: A typo on page 35 lines 11, and 15, where “effect” should be --affect--.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Objections***

7. Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities: A typo in line 1, where “the working definitions” should be --wherein the working definitions--. Appropriate correction is required.

8. Claims 12, 16, and 20 are objected to because of the following informalities: A typo in line 5, 7, and 6, respectively, where “effects” should be --affects--. Appropriate correction is required.

9. Claim 24 is objected to because of the following informalities: A typo in lines 8 and 11, where “effected” should be --affected--. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

10. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

11. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification states: “The application development server defines all of the roles in a development process. The

application development server may also define the particular roles that team members perform” (page 40, lines 4-7). This is in contrast to claims 3 and 4 where it is claimed that working definitions define roles and team members. The specification does not describe the use of working definitions as a means for defining roles. Therefore, the specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to make and/or use a working definition that defines roles and team members.

In the interest of further examination, the examiner has interpreted these claims, as reflected in the specification, so instead of “working definitions” to be --application development server--.

12. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification does not describe how one of the plurality of computing environments support a clients role in a parallel processing application. While the specification states “the same sorts of mechanisms can be used to distribute roles without qualification, to distribute roles based off the clients identity, or to strictly define a set of clients that are to play very particular roles within, for example, a workflow management, distributed computing, or parallel processing scenarios” (page 39 line 27 – page 40 line 3), it does not describe it in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains to make and/or use the invention.

13. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the

specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification states: “the application development server may define the role of an application developer, manager, and tester. However, it may also support a manufacturing assembly line workflow process where data processing systems are used to operate a variety of automated machines and tools” (page 40, lines 14-19). This is in contrast to claim 8 where it is claimed that working definitions support management of a workflow application. The specification does not describe the use of working definitions as a means for supporting management of a workflow application. Also, the specification does not describe in any detail how it supports management of a workflow application. It simply makes the statement without further information. Therefor, the specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to make and/or use a working definition that supports management of a workflow application.

In the interest of further examination, the examiner has interpreted these claims, as reflected in the specification, so instead of “working definition” to be --application development server--.

14. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

15. Claims 2, 5, 6, 9, 12, 13, 16, 17, 20, 21 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

16. Claim 2 recites the limitation "the network" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The examiner has interpreted this limitation to mean "the communications line".

17. Claim 5 recites the limitation "the encapsulated development environment" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The examiner has interpreted this limitation to mean "the requested one of the plurality of computing environments".

18. Claim 6 recites the limitation "the encapsulated development environment" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The examiner has interpreted this limitation to mean "the requested one of the plurality of computing environments".

19. Claim 9 recites the limitation "the network" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The examiner has interpreted this limitation to mean "the communications line".

20. The term "construct" in claims 12, 16, 20, and 24 is unclear. This term is not generally accepted in the art to which this claim is related, and it is not adequately defined in the specification. The examiner has interpreted this term to mean "development environment".

21. Claims 13, 17, and 21 are dependent upon claims 12, 16, and 20, respectively, and suffer the same limitations as those claims so they are rejected for the reasons set forth above.

22. Claims 13, 17, and 21 recite the limitation "the change" in line 2. It is unclear which change this refers to, as the parent claims contain multiple instances of change. The examiner has interpreted this limitation to mean "the detected change".

***Double Patenting***

23. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

24. Claims 12, 16, 20, and 24 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 4, 15, 26, and (24 and 26), respectively, of copending Application No. 09/552,862. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are obvious variations of each other.

The instant claim 12 recites:

*detecting a change within a data processing system (see copending application claim 1, line 3);*

*responsive to a determination that the change effects a working definition of the construct, modifying the working definition of the construct to reflect a change indicated by the change (see copending application claim 1 lines 13-15); and*

*updating the runtime representations of the construct (see copending application claim 4).*

The instant claim 12 is different from copending application claim 4 because:

- (a) the instant claim 12 does not refer to a “computer system” as referred to in the copending application claim 4 line 3, but instead refers to a “data processing system”. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to monitor a data processing system in order to detect changes.
- (b) “the change is in conflict with the set of constraints” in the copending application claim 1 lines 13-14 is replaced with “the change affects a working definition” in the instant claim 12. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to detect a change affecting a working definition in order to make necessary arrangements for the respective runtime representation.
- (c) “repairing the runtime image” of copending claim 4 lines 2-3 is replaced by “updating the runtime representations” of the instant claim 12 line 8. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to enhance execution performance while ensuring a consistent execution environment.

Instant claims 16 and 20 are product and system versions of the instant claim 12, and are similar to copending application claims 15 and 26 which are product and system versions of copending application claim 4. Therefore, they are rejected under the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 12 above.

Claim 24 of the instant application recites

*detection means for detecting changes to the computer system* (see copending application claim 23 line 3);

*comparison means for comparing the changes to working definitions of applications* (see copending application claim 23 lines 4-5);

*updating means for updating working definitions of effected applications to reflect the changes thereby producing updated working definitions* (see copending application claim 23 lines 9-11, and copending application claim 24); and

*construction means for constructing an updated valid runtime representation of the effected applications using updated working definitions* (see copending application claim 26 lines 2-4).

The instant claim 24 is different from copending application claim 26 because:

(a) copending application claim 24 does not recite the phrase “to reflect the changes thereby producing updated working definitions” which is included in the instant application claim 24. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to modify the working definitions to enhance performance and ensure a consistent execution environment.

(b) “repairing the runtime image” in copending claim 26 is replaced with “means for constructing an updated valid runtime representation” in the instant claim 24. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to provide a correct environment for development.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

25. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

26. Claims 1, 12, 13, 16, 17, 20, 21 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,832,266 to Crow et al. (hereinafter referred to as Crow).

Regarding claim 1, Crow discloses:

*a storage unit for storing a plurality of working definitions for a plurality of computing environments (See Figure 84, “846”); and*

*an interface for receiving requests for one of the plurality of computing environments from and transferring the requested one of the plurality of computing environments to a client over a communications line* (see column 1 lines 44-46: “The encapsulation shell also acts as an interface between the object management facility and the first application.”);

*wherein the working definition for each computing environment is sufficient from which to construct a valid runtime image of the respective computing environment ()*.

Crow also discloses an encapsulation facility which includes an encapsulation shell and a shell filter (“The encapsulation facility includes an encapsulation shell and a shell filter. The encapsulation shell is referenced by objects as if the encapsulation shell was an application designed to run in conjunction with the object management facility. The encapsulation shell also acts as an interface between the object management facility and the first application. The shell filter interacts with the encapsulation shell and upon instruction from the encapsulation shell is able to intercept commands from a user to the first application. The shell filter also forwards to the first application commands generated by the encapsulation shell. ...OMF 100 stores information indicating which objects go with which application. Objects which are associated with a single application are considered to be objects of the same type, or the same class. For instance, object 202, 203, 204, and 205 are of the same class because each is associated with application 101.”; see column 1 lines 41-50, and column 6 lines 15-20).

Regarding claim 12, Crow discloses: *A method of providing different views into a development environment, the method comprising:*

*detecting a change within a data processing system* (see column 18 lines 37-40:

“When a data from a child object is being displayed by a parent object, and the child object changes the displayed data, the child object notifies OMF that there has been a change in the data object”);

*responsive to a determination that the change affects a working definition of the development environment, modifying the working definition of the development environment to reflect a change indicated by the change* (column 18, lines 61-64: “If the parent object of any of the links is not active, OMF set the bit VS\_NEWDATAANNOUNCED for that link in HPOMF.XRF.” Here, OMF manages the working definition comprising HPOMF.XRF.); *and*

*updating the runtime representations of the development environment* (see column 19 lines 2-4: “The parent object sends a messages to the child object if it wants the new data displayed”).

Regarding claim 13, Crow discloses a change which is an event (see column 18 lines 37-40: “When a data from a child object is being displayed by a parent object, and the child object changes the displayed data, the child objects notifies OMF that there has been a change in the data object.”).

Regarding claims 16 and 20, they are product and system versions of claim 12, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 12 above.

Regarding claims 17 and 21, they are product and system versions of claim 13, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 13 above.

Regarding claim 24, Crow discloses: *A synchronization facility for synchronizing various views of a development environment comprising:*

*detection means for detecting changes to the computer system* (column 18 lines 37-40: “When a data from a child object is being displayed by a parent object, and the child object changes the displayed data, the child object notifies OMF that there has been a change in the data object”);

*comparison means for comparing the changes to working definitions of applications* (comparison is inherent step in the prior step of detection);

*updating means for updating working definitions of affected applications to reflect the changes thereby producing updated working definitions* (column 18, lines 61-64: “If the parent object of any of the links is not active, OMF set the bit VS\_NEWDATAANNOUNCED for that link in HPOMF.XRF.” Here, OMF manages the working definition comprising HPOMF.XRF.”); and

*construction means for constructing an updated valid runtime representation of the affected applications using updated working definitions* (see column 19 lines 2-4: “The parent object sends a messages to the child object if it wants the new data displayed”).

27. Claims 1, 2, 5, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,145,119 to House et al. (hereinafter referred to as House).

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention “by another,” or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Regarding claim 1, House discloses:

*a storage unit for storing a plurality of working definitions for a plurality of computing environments* (see column 3 line 60: “The first tier comprises a client computer having a monitor and one or more data storage devices”, and Figure 1); and

*an interface for receiving requests for one of the plurality of computing environments from and transferring the requested one of the plurality of computing environments to a client over a communications line* (see column 4, lines 23-27: “The RDBMS receives requests either directly from tier-2 and/or indirectly from tier-2 via the VAB-II runtime module, and then performs the desired database functions”, and Figure 1); *wherein*

*the working definition for each computing environment is sufficient from which to construct a valid runtime image of the respective computing environment* (see column 2 line 67-column 3 line 4: “The data structure comprises a first section comprising the executable programming logic, and all data needed to load and execute the project application on the computer, and a second section for storing other data, including data required to restore the project environment”).

Regarding claim 2, House discloses: *wherein the communications line is the Internet* (column 2 lines 52-55: “...the present invention discloses a method, apparatus, and article of manufacture for providing a programming development environment that supports the development of Internet and Intranet applications”).

Regarding claim 5, House discloses: *wherein the requested one of the plurality of computing environments comprises source code for the application* (column 2 lines 57-60: “The data structure allows all elements and associations necessary to build the components of the project, such as the source, objects, executables to be contained or described in a single file”).

Regarding claim 9, House discloses: *wherein the communications line is an intranet* (column 2 lines 52-55: “...the present invention discloses a method, apparatus, and article of manufacture for providing a programming development environment that supports the development of Internet and Intranet applications”).

28. Claims 10-21, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,754,857 to Gadol.

Regarding claim 10, Gadol discloses *A method of providing an encapsulated development environment for automated software development to a client, the method comprising:*

*receiving a request for the encapsulated development environment, wherein the encapsulated development environment comprises platform independent definitions defining an application and environment from which a runtime representation of the environment may be constructed* (column 3 lines 9-13: “The requester is configured to control messages issued by the client on the network, one of which is a document request message instructing a particular one of the servers to transmit to the client a workflow courier requested by a user of the client.”; and column 3 lines 23-27: “The workflow courier also includes state data indicating executed stages in the workflow and a registry containing at least one code fragment reference, each of which points to an executable code fragment.”; also column 4 line 51-53: “...the code fragments are executables written in a platform-independent computer language, such as Java.”);

*retrieving the encapsulated development environment* (see column 3 lines 13 and 14: “The provider, which is configured to be responsive to the messages directed to the server...”); *and*

*sending the encapsulated development environment to the client* (see column 3 lines 14-16: "...<the provider> responds to the provider's document request message by causing the server to transmit to the client the workflow courier.").

Regarding claim 11, Gadol discloses receiving an update and modifying the encapsulated environment (see column 6, lines 62-66: "If the workflow has not been completed, the workflow courier transmits itself as the updated workflow courier to the client ... and optionally sends a status update to the database server.")

Regarding claim 12, Gadol discloses: *A method of providing different views into a development environment, the method comprising:*  
*detecting a change within a data processing system;*  
*responsive to a determination that the change affects a working definition of the development environment, modifying the working definition of the development environment to reflect a change indicated by the change; and*  
*updating the runtime representations of the development environment.* (see column 6, lines 58-66: "After the user completes the first stage, the courier updates itself and then determines whether the workflow has been completed. If the workflow has not been completed, the workflow courier transmits itself as the updated workflow courier to the client of the actor who is authorized to perform the next stage of the workflow and optionally sends a status update to the database server." Here, the runtime representation is called the courier, and the working definition is stored on the database server.)

Regarding claim 13, Gadol discloses a change as an event (see column 6, lines 52-55: "The actor then performs the first stage by filling in appropriate fields of the forms...").

Regarding claims 14 and 18, they are product and system versions of claim 10, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 10 above.

Regarding claims 15 and 19, they are product and system versions of claim 11, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 11 above.

Regarding claims 16 and 20, they are product and system versions, respectively, of claim 12 and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 12 above.

Regarding claims 17 and 21, they are product and system versions, respectively, of claim 13 and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 13 above.

Regarding claim 24, Gadol discloses:

*detection means for detecting changes to the computer system;*  
*comparison means for comparing the changes to working definitions of applications;*  
*updating means for updating working definitions of effected applications to reflect the changes thereby producing updated working definitions; and*  
*construction means for constructing an updated valid runtime representation of the effected applications using updated working definitions* (see column 6, lines 58-66:  
“After the user completes the first stage, the courier updates itself and then determines whether the workflow has been completed. If the workflow has not been completed, the workflow courier transmits itself as the updated workflow courier to the client of the actor who is authorized to perform the next stage of the workflow and optionally sends a status update to the database server.” Here, the runtime representation is called the courier, and the working definition is stored on the database server.).

29. Claims 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,029,196 to Lenz.

Regarding claim 22, Lenz discloses: *A memory for storing data for access by an application program executed on a data processing system, comprising:*  
*a data structure stored in the memory, the data structure comprising:*  
*a plurality of conditions; and*  
*a plurality of working definitions; wherein*  
*each of the plurality of working definitions is sufficient from which to construct a valid runtime representation of a corresponding application* (column 1 lines 56-

58: “The automatic client configuration system provides the system administrator with the ability to configure every client in a network with one file.”); *and*

*the plurality of conditions determine which of the plurality of working definitions are expressed on the occurrence of an event* (column 1, lines 61-62: “Control over logical groupings of clients is possible using separate configuration files for each group.”; and column 2 lines 3-5: “When the timeout expires, the client upon the next subsequent network access, requests the configuration file from the server.”).

Regarding claim 23, the determination of which of the plurality of working definitions expressed, inherently suppresses other working definitions, and so the claim is also anticipated by Lentz for the same reason as the rejection of claim 22 (column 1 lines 61-62).

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

30. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

31. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over House.

House does not expressly disclose the use of parallel processing applications.

Official notice is taken that parallel processing applications is conventional and well known.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adapt House's invention to work in a parallel processing environment. One would be motivated to do so since it is a well known technique for application speedup, simulation, and development.

32. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over House as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Gadol.

House does not expressly disclose the management of a workflow application. Gadol discloses the management of a workflow application (column 2 lines 54-57).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use House's development environment with Gadol's workflow application. One would be motivated to do so since it would improve productivity in a development environment by promoting a workflow pipeline.

33. Claims 3, 4, 6, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over House et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,423,042 to Jalili et al.

Regarding claim 3, House does not disclose: *defining roles for application development and support the roles.*

Jalili discloses the use of roles as a means of limiting access (see column 14, lines 1-6: “Part number 1 can be implemented with a field in the function.sub.-- table entry (also the init.sub.-- table entry) where the field indicates which clients can execute the particular function associated with that entry. The indication can be as simple as a client name or a list of client names”).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use House’s application development system with Jalili’s roles to limit access to certain objects. The motivation for doing this is that protections or permissions allow or disallow certain clients from making certain requests.

Regarding claim 4, House does not disclose: *define application development team members and a role each team member holds.*

Jalili discloses the use of names as a means of limiting access (see column 14, lines 1-6: “Part number 1 can be implemented with a field in the function.sub.-- table entry (also the init.sub.-- table entry) where the field indicates which clients can execute the particular function associated with that entry. The indication can be as simple as a client name or a list of client names”).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use House’s application development system with Jalili’s list of names to limit access to certain objects. The motivation for doing this is that protections or permissions allow or disallow certain clients from making certain requests.

Regarding claim 6, House does not disclose: *wherein encrypted links are sent to the client along with the requested one of the plurality of computing environments, the encrypted links providing support for development, testing, beta testing, and deployment of the application.*

Jalili discloses a system of communication using encrypted links (see column 14, lines 8-13: “Part number 2 can be implemented by associating with each client an encrypted identifier, which the client uses for all transactions with the server. The server then, based on the client's identification and the permissions associated with a function, authorizes or denies the clients requests.”)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use House's application development system with Jalili's encryption to protect access to certain objects. The motivation for doing this is that protections or permissions allow or disallow certain clients from making certain requests.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to J. Derek Rutten whose telephone number is (703) 605-5233. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-3.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (703)305-4552. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Art Unit: 2122

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)306-5484.

Chameli C. Don  
jdr Patent Examiner  
A.U. 2122

9/4/03